

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following observations.

Interview Summary

An interview was conducted with the Examiner on October 28, 2011. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the opportunity to discuss the response filed on October 14, 2011. The amended claims were discussed with respect to the requirements of 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

In the claims

Claim 1 is amended to clarify language identified as indefinite as suggested by the Examiner during the interview on October 28, 2011 based on the claims as amended in the response filed on October 14, 2011.

Dependent claims 2, 8, 12, 15-17, 19, and 32-35 are amended to be consistent with the clarifications made to amended claim 1.

No new matter is introduced by the amendment to the claims.

Entry of the supplemental amendment to the claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of claims 2-12, 14-17, 19, and 32-35 under 35 USC 112

Claim 1 has been amended to distinctly recite the features of the originally-issued value documents and the upgraded value documents. The features of the at least one

originally-issued value document are recited separately from the features of the at least one upgraded value document.

Dependent claims 2, 8, 12, 15-17, 19, and 32-35 have also been amended to clarify whether the features recited therein refer to the originally-issued value document, the at least one upgraded value document, or both.

In view of these amendments to the claims, it is submitted that the claims comply with 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejections is kindly requested.

Rejection of claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-15, 17, 19, and 32 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of EP 0 052 624 (*Kaule*)

Rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Rejection of claims 33 and 34 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of *Anti-Stokes Phosphors/Luminophors (ASPL)*

Rejection of claim 35 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of US patent 5,169,155 (*Soules*)

The remarks made with respect to these references in the responses filed on September 15, 2011 are still considered to be relevant and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Withdrawal of the rejections is kindly requested.

10/10

Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: December 2, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin J. Cassell/

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205